

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24-28, and 30 have been amended. Claims 6, 9, 13, 18, 22, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 31-35 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-17, 19-21, 23-28, and 30-35 are now presented for examination.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Skret

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 20-23, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent 5,001,755 of Skret (“Skret”).

Claim 1, as amended here, includes “storing a security sequence value from the plurality of synchronized security sequence values as a resynchronization value”, and “requesting resynchronization of security sequence values, requesting resynchronization comprising sending at least a representation of said resynchronization value from said client device to said server device”. It is submitted that, among other differences, Skret does not teach or suggest these elements of the claim.

Skret describes a security network for a system. The system as described includes certain nodes, with each node having separate encryption and decryption keys for every node with which it may communicate. The keys are generated by a pseudorandom generator that produces a new key for each transmission. (Skret, col. 2, lines 10-20) Skret indicates that a generator in a receiving mode is synchronized with a generator in a transmitting node. In this regard, Skret indicates that “[a] resynchronizing mechanism is

also provided to align the pseudorandom number generators in the event synchronization is lost due to the loss of power or other reasons.” (Skret, col. 2, lines 20-27)

However, the description of the resynchronization process that is provided in Skret is clearly different than the elements of the claims. Skret indicates that when a receiving node determines that it is out of sequence, such as in a power down and subsequent power up by a node, the node requests resynchronization. (Skret, col. 6, lines 7-13) Skret then indicates that “the request for resynchronization must be sent in clear text since the receiver’s encrypted transmitter, which is separate, will most likely be out of synchronization as well from a power down.” (Skret, col. 6, lines 14-17) Therefore, Skret is suggesting a simple, unencrypted message from the receiving node to the transmitting node. In response, “the current pseudorandom number (key) is encrypted using the starting pseudorandom number (key) and transmitted to the node which is out of synchronization. Thereafter, the pseudorandom number sequence picks up where it left off.” (Skret, col. 6, lines 18-23) Thus, Skret is describing a system in which the sequence is again matched by using the first key to encrypt the current key. This first key then may be updated periodically. “The key used for resynchronization can be varied periodically by transmitting between the two nodes a new resynchronization key which may vary from the starting key.” (Skret, col. 6, lines 23-26)

The Office Action cites to Skret for storing a security sequence value as a resynchronization value, column 5, line 41 through column 6, line 2. However, the cited text is an explanation of the use of a particular encryption process for a transmitting node in which a stream of pseudorandom numbers are used for encryption of the series of characters of a communication, with a separate sequence used for the receiving node.

Skret indicates that a sequence counter is used in the transmitting node to keep track of the sequence, and a separate sequence counter is used for each receiving node. This only regards keeping track of where in the sequence encryption has occurred does not indicate that a resynchronization value is stored. The sequence counter is used to keep the units synchronized, not to address a need for resynchronization. There is no mention of the storing of a resynchronization value, and the text quoted above referring to a “clear text” request would indicate that no such value is transmitted.

Among other differences, Skret does not provide for a request for resynchronization that includes sending at least a representation of a resynchronization value. Instead, Skret provides for a “clear text” request for resynchronization that does not include any resynchronization value. Thus, Skret does not provide for storing a resynchronization value or for a request for resynchronization that includes a resynchronization value.

It is submitted that the above argument is also applicable to rejected independent claims 20 and 28, and such claims are thus also allowable. The remaining rejected claims are dependent claims that are allowable as being dependent on the allowable base claims.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Skret in view of Trachewsky

The Examiner rejected claims 5-9 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skret in view of U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0206559 of Trachewsky, et al. (“Trachewsky”).

It is submitted that the above arguments also apply to independent claims 5, 14, and 18. It is respectfully submitted the Trachewsky is not relevant to the claims and does

not contain the elements missing from Skret. For this reason, the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of the claims.

Trachewsky concerns a method of determining the start of a transmitted frame. The method involves the use of multiple copies of a preamble sequence and the filtering of a received frame using filter coefficients that are matched to the preamble symbol sequence. Trachewsky is not relevant to establishing secured communications.

The Office Action indicates that Trachewsky “discloses acknowledging a client request in using sequence value”, citing to paragraph 0458 of the reference. However, this is not relevant to the element in question. What Trachewsky discusses is requests for a CSS sequence, which with a CSS sequence being a set of values for collision signaling slots. As indicated in Trachewsky, in a transmission one of the components of delay is collision overhead, in which multiple stations wish to send at the same priority. In order to provide voice over IP service, latency needs to be controlled, which may involve the assignment of CSS sequences. (See Trachewsky, ¶ 0451) In short, the meaning of “sequence” in Trachewsky is completely different than in the claims. The reference is not concerned with any type of security sequence, but is rather concerned with a particular set of values that are used to resolve issues regarding the allocation of slots to multiple competing transmitters. Further, the reference simply has no relevance to the elements of the claims, and cannot properly be combined with Skret.

For at least the above reasons, independent claims

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Skret in view of Trachewsky, et al. and Dixon, et al,

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 10, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skret in view of Trachewsky and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,857 of Dixon, et al. (“Dixon”).

It is respectfully that Dixon does not contain the elements missing from Skret and Trachewsky. For this reason, the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of the claims.

Dixon discusses a network security policy using a finite state machine to maintain the security policy information. Dixon is not relevant to the storing of a resynchronization value or the transmission of the resynchronization value in the event of desynchronization.

Further, the rejected claims are dependent claims and are allowable as being dependent on the allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/28/05



Mark C. Van Ness
Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778